| | Case 5:03-cv-00647-JF Document 9 | 9 Filed 07/03/07 Page 1 of 1 |
|---------------------------------|---|---|
| | | |
| 1 | | |
| 2 | | |
| 3 | | |
| 4 | | |
| 5 | | |
| 6 7 | LINITED STAT | ES DISTRICT COURT |
| 8 | NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA | |
| 9 | SAN JOSE DIVISION | |
| 10 | ARTHUR G. MAIONCHI, et al., | Case No.: C 03-0647 JF PVT |
| 11 | Plaintiffs, | ORDER SETTING BRIEFING AND |
| 12 | v.) |) HEARING SCHEDULE FOR) PLAINTIFFS' MOTION TO EXCLUDE) EXPERT WITNESS TESTIMONY) |
| 13 | UNION PACIFIC CORPORATION, | |
| 14 | Defendant. | |
| 15 |) | |
| 16 | On July 2, 2007, the parties filed a stipulated request for an order shortening time for hearing | |
| 17 | on Plaintiffs' motion to exclude the testimony of experts Plaintiffs argue were not timely disclosed. ¹ | |
| 18 | Based on the stipulation and the file herein, | |
| 19 | IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Defendant shall electronically file its opposition papers no | |
| 20 | later than NOON on July 6, 2007. No reply may be filed. ² The motion shall be heard at 10:00 a.m. | |
| 21 | on July 10, 2007. | |
| 22 | Dated: 7/3/07 | |
| 23 | PATRICIA V. TRUMBULL United States Magistrate Judge | |
| 24 | | |
| 25 | | |
| 26 | The holding of this court is limited to the facts and the particular circumstance underlying the present motion. | |
| 2728 | Plaintiffs waited over two weeks after receiving Defendant's expert disclosures to file this motion. A briefing schedule that allows Plaintiffs to file a reply less than 2 office hours before the hearing is patently unreasonable. | |
| | | DER, page 1 |